

cord that have been sown for the last thirty years should not be allowed to produce their fruit, of disaster, and that influences should be interposed that will avert such result and will bring these two peoples together under conditions of harmony and good feeling.

So much for this continent. Then we have a wider scope of influence for the English speaking people. We have North America with its capabilities of supporting 500 millions of people, and in my opinion it will have that number speaking the English tongue, within the next 150 years. We have in addition the great empire of which we form a part, the empire with its colonies and its influences ramifying the world, the empire upon whose dominions the sun never sets, the empire that stands to-day almost isolated among the nations of Europe. We have the relations of that empire with the United States to take into consideration, a matter of transcendent importance. Sir, the relations existing between Canada and the United States will have an important, and may have a controlling influence upon the relations that will exist between these two great nations. And so when we stand here and say that this is a question of little moment, we don't care whether we have good relations or evil relations, why, we are taking a most shortsighted and purblind view of the great field of future operations. We are taking a view of our own responsibilities which is far beneath the importance that belongs to them. If we can in any way institute and consummate any policy that will bring together these people, that will put an end to this bickering and animosity, the mutual disregard for each other these mutual statements of a belittling and insulting character which we see in our press, which are even uttered by our public men, if we can put an end to all this, we shall have accomplished something for humanity, something for the liberty of the world. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I stand for reciprocity. I stand for it because I believe that there is something in it higher than the price of cod fish, than the price of wheat, than the balance of trade. I stand for reciprocity because I believe the infinite possibilities of the future will be promoted and developed by bringing together these two peoples. Well, now, what are the prospects?

Mr. HEYI. Very poor.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very poor, my hon. friend says. My hon. friend from St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says that we have been working for reciprocity for twenty-five years. Well, I would remind him that he that waits long finally succeeds. You want to exercise patience in waiting. It is true that our applications for reciprocity have not been met with that degree of favour which we would desire. But I have reason to believe that times are changing; and when our Conservative friends speak slightly of this, and when they take a

position opposed to reciprocity, when they say: You cannot get it, what is the use of trying—I do not sympathize with that position at all. The condition of public opinion in the United States as regards Canada is constantly improving. Those who know the developments of the Joint High Commission, which I am not at liberty to enter upon in detail, know that even then, there was substantial progress made towards the settlement of questions between these two countries, progress that would probably have given us a treaty that we would have considered at that time as satisfactory. That the intervening Alaska question and the indignation of the British commissioners at the course pursued by the United States, broke off those negotiations for the time being, I think was a very fortunate thing for Canada. I believe that when the commission reassembles, as I assume it will, we shall reassemble under conditions much more favourable to the securing of a desirable treaty than existed when the commission dispersed. I believe that the condition of things has vastly improved, that the Americans have become disabused of their false impressions in regard to Canada, that they understood this country better, that they know that instead of dealing with a little offshoot of the British empire, with an obscure colony, they are dealing with a country possessing the resources of an empire, with a country that will become a vast and powerful state. They are realizing this now. They have seized upon the facts. They were ignorant of these matters because they had never been brought to their attention. The progress of the campaign of instruction instituted three years ago has been most satisfactory and instead of supposing Canada to be a narrow strip of frozen country stretching along their frontier they know now that it is a country of enormous resources, that the isothermal line stretches to Slave Lake and that there are 300,000,000 acres of fertile land, 3,000,000 of which now only are under cultivation. They understand the potentiality of its infinite resources, that this country is about to enter upon the race of progress and run that race not only with giant strides, but with great rapidity, and understanding this—perhaps I may be competent to judge to some extent of the changes in American public sentiment—in my opinion, the time is more propitious than it has been since the making of the treaty of 1854 for securing a treaty with the United States. My hon. friend from St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) thinks, as I read the report of his speech last night, that it is not best to wait for results. The principle of protection he says is too firmly rooted even among the farmers of the United States, to permit us to hope for reciprocity. I would remind him that the reciprocity sentiment has taken firm hold on the great west; that the Republicans of the great Republican state of Iowa, headed